

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 6, 12-13, 16, 18-20, 22, 24-27, 35, 38-39, 43, 46-47, 58-61 and 69-72 are pending in the Application.

Claims 1-3, 6, 12-13, 16, 18-20, 22, 24-27, 35, 38-39, 43, 46-47, 58-61 and 69-72 stand rejected.

I. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-2, 6, 13, 16, 18-20, 24-27, 58-61, 69, 71 and 72 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Sharma et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,452,289). In response, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. As the Examiner is well aware, for a claim to be anticipated under § 102, each and every element must be found within the cited reference.

Applicants have amended most of the rejected claims in a manner so that they overcome the § 102 rejections as being anticipated by *Sharma*. The Examiner has interpreted the MUX 310 as being equal to the recited switching circuitry in the claims, and the devices 60, 10a, 80, 70, and 90 as being the plurality of telecommunications devices to which a call is connected by the switching circuitry. Applicants have amended the claims to more clearly recite that the switching circuitry switches a call incoming to the system to one of a plurality of telecommunications devices, which are extensions to the system. MUX 310 cannot do this, and in fact a call incoming to MUX 310 from the telephone line interface 309 is merely connected to a single telecommunications device, which is digital telephone codec 305 and the telephone parts 301-304. MUX 310 does not have any switching capability wherein it can connect an incoming call to a plurality of extensions. Furthermore, MUX 310 is not capable of identifying the intended telecommunications device to which the call is meant to be directed to.

Claim 27 recites circuitry for listening to a voice signal at a telephone extension coupled to the system, wherein this voice signal is recorded by the activated recording sequence, and that the voice signal originates from a voice mail message stored in the system. Applicants respectfully assert that this claim limitation is not taught or suggested anywhere

within *Sharma*. Furthermore, Applicant's respectfully assert that the Examiner's rejection in paragraph 4, page 3 of Paper No. 7 does not specifically address this claim limitation, and therefore the Examiner has failed to prove a *prima facie* showing of anticipation in rejecting claim 27.

With respect to claim 72, *Sharma* does not in any way disclose circuitry for permitting a user of a telephone coupled to the system to monitor a voice mail message while the message is being recorded into the user's mailbox. Furthermore, the Examiner has failed to specifically address this claim limitation.

As a result of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully assert that all of the Claims in the application are patentable over the cited prior art.

## II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 3 and 70 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over *Sharma* in view of *Daly et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,274,738). In response, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. TDM chip 44 is not the same as a digital cross-point matrix which is well defined in the art as not being the same as a circuit that performs a time division multiplexing operation, which is what TDM chip 44 does. Time division multiplexing is a technique for transmitting a number of separate data, voice and/or video signals simultaneously over one communications medium by quickly interleaving a piece of each signal one after another. Newton's Telecom Dictionary, Harry Newton, sixteenth edition, page 863. In contrast, a cross-point switch is an array of cross-points wherein one of N inputs is selectively connected to one of M outputs. See U.S. Patent No. 5,060,192, col. 1, lines 9-11. See also U.S. Patent No. 4,360,809 for another disclosure on a cross-point switch. Therefore, *Sharma* and *Daly* do not teach or suggest such a cross-point switch.

On page 7 of Paper No. 9, the Examiner has attempted to respond to the foregoing arguments by also citing to Newton's Telecom Dictionary for the definition of "crosspoint." Applicants respectfully assert that this response by the Examiner is inadequate, since Applicants have not merely recited a "crosspoint." Instead, Applicants have recited a "digital crosspoint matrix." In fact, the TDM chips 44 and 46 in *Daly* operate in an opposite fashion as the digital crosspoint switch of the present invention, since the TDM chips merely operate

to combine signals from the various audio cards 18a, 18b ... 18n to the application processors 38 and eventually to the host processor 24. The TDM chips 44 and 46, especially TDM chip 44 does not operate to connect a call to one of the telephones 22a, 22b ... 22n. An exemplary operation of the system in *Daly* is described from column 3, line 58 through column 4, line 46. In fact, *Daly* states that switching equipment, such as PBXs are connected to the telephones 22 through the telephone lines 23. Column 2, lines 6-10. Thus, there is no need for switching of telephone calls through the TDM chip 44.

### III. CONCLUSION

As a result of the foregoing, it is asserted by Applicants that the remaining Claims in the Application are in condition for allowance, and respectfully request an early allowance of such Claims.

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner call Applicants' attorney at the below listed number if the Examiner believes that such a discussion would be helpful in resolving any remaining problems.

Respectfully submitted,

WINSTEAD SECHREST & MINICK P.C.  
Attorneys for Applicant

By: 

Kelly K. Kordzik  
Reg. No. 36,571

5400 Renaissance Tower  
1201 Elm Street  
Dallas, Texas 75270-2199  
(512) 370-2851